UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/445,769	04/19/2000	DO-HYOUNG KIM	Q57164	1355

7590 11/21/2008

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER	
PEYTON, TAMMARA R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2182	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/445,769	KIM, DO-HYOUNG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAMMARA R. PEYTON	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-4,8,9,13 and 16-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *16-18* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-4,8,9,13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/24/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 8, 9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al., (US 5,371,553), sited as prior art 06/05/02.

As per claim 2, 13, and 14, Kawamura teaches a method for displaying changes in operation states of network devices on a display screen (Figs. 1, 5, col. 7, lines 17-col. 9, lines 1-40) of a client device (21 acts as a client device) which operates as a client in a network where various digital devices connected to the network (26a/26b to 29a/29b) operate as one of the client and server devices ((21 acts as a client device and server device to 22 to 25), the method comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving, at the client device, a predetermined signal (See Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 1-53) that indicates changes in the operation states of the server devices, from the server devices, and displaying the change in the operation state of a specific device on a screen thereof, wherein the client device establishes said communication channel with respect to the server devices by

periodic polling in the step (a), wherein said periodic polling occurs at regular intervals. (Kawamura discloses wherein it is possible to "poll" the devices 22 to 25 to determine its current status, col. 3, lines 35 - col. 6, lines 1-10, Notes cols.10-18)

Kawamura specifically teaches the GUI display device (21) is a client device or a server device and the GUI device monitors/detects the presence of attached devices and establishes a communication channel with the attached device. Kawamura teaches of the client device establishing the communication channel with respect to the server device and displaying operation change on the GUI display. Applicant argues on page 2, that Kawamura is silent in respect to polling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that Kawamura clearly teaches "polling" for the devices 22 to 25 to determine its current status, col. 3, lines 35 - col. 6, lines 1-10, Notes cols.10-18

As per claim 2, Applicant argues that "even if, arguendo, a JAVA applet is known in the art, there is no indication of how a JAVA applet would be incorporated into the invention of Kawamuara. The Examiner is obviously utilizing impermissible hindsight reasoning in determining that the features of claim 3 would have been obvious to incorporate into Kawamura," page. 3. Applicant is off the mark in arguing that the motivation to combine needs to be found in a specific reference. (In re Oetiker, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (CAFC 1992)) The measure is what the teachings of the references would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, not what the references specifically suggest. Further, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning of graphical

user interfaces provided by online services. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. (See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971)

Therein, Kawamura does not teach the use of a Java applet. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that Java applet applications are well known in the art. Further, Kawamura teaches using GUIs that provides real-time displays of images representing devices (22 to 26) coupled to a bus structure. Therefore, Kawamura would have been motivated to implement Java applets into the GUI in order to expand the flexibility of Kawamura real-time displays of devices coupled to the bus structure.

As per claims 8 -11, Kawamura teaches wherein said operation states comprise at least one play, tray-open, pause, and stop.

Conclusion

Finally, Examiner has provided two new pieces of prior art further explaining why Java applet application are well known in the art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammara Peyton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4157. The examiner can normally be reached between 6:30 - 4:00 from Monday to Thursday, (I am off every first Friday), and 6:30-3:00 every second Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the
Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

/Tammara R Peyton/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2182

November 10, 2008